

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 3, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Nishikawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,491).

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishikawa et al.* in view of *Knapp* (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,250).

Claim 6 stands stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishikawa et al.* in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,492,289).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishikawa et al.* in view of *Sugimoto* (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,487).

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishikawa et al.* in view of *Tsuzuki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,922,444).

Claim 11 is allowed.

Claim 4 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants cancel claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer, amend claims 3, 5 and 10, and add new claim 12 by this amendment. Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 6-12 are currently pending.

The Disposition of the Claims

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claim 11 and the Examiner's indication that claims 4-5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly,

Applicants have canceled claim 4 without prejudice or disclaimer, amended claim 3 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4, and amended claim 5 to depend from claim 3. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that at least because claims 2 and 6-9 depend from claim 3, claims 2 and 6-9 are also in condition for allowance.

While Applicants agree that these claims are allowable and patentably distinguish over the prior art, Applicants respectfully do not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each and every feature is required for patentability.

Further, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable in light of the documents relied upon by the Examiner for the following reasons.

Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Nishikawa et al.* To the extent that this rejection might be applied to claim 10, as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Nishikawa et al.* does not anticipate claim 10 because *Nishikawa et al.* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that *Nishikawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 10, as newly-amended, including at least "wherein at least part of the surface of the insulator is covered with a glaze layer, the glaze layer contains 1 mol% or less of PbO, the glaze layer has a Vickers hardness Hv of 100 or more, and the glaze layer is formed by adding at least one of phosphates, sulfates, and chlorides."

According to an embodiment of the instant invention as claimed, a glaze layer is formed by adding at least one of phosphates, sulfates, and chlorides. Also, see, for example, the

discussion at page 10, line 18 – page 12, line 21 of the specification. As mentioned at page 12, lines 5-15, the using of the fluoride ion could be less desirable.

The Office Action asserts that “*Nishikawa et al.* discloses that the glaze layer contains at least one of phosphates, sulfates and fluorides and chlorides.” However, it is respectfully submitted that *Nishikawa et al.* appears to show using only fluoride ion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Nishikawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 10, as newly-amended, including at least “wherein at least part of the surface of the insulator is covered with a glaze layer, the glaze layer contains 1 mol% or less of PbO, the glaze layer has a Vickers hardness Hv of 100 or more, and the glaze layer is formed by adding at least one of phosphates, sulfates, and chlorides.”

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Applicants respectfully submit that since *Nishikawa et al.* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10, *Nishikawa et al.* does not anticipate claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

New Claim 12

Applicants have added new claim 12 to differently define the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable at least because none of the applied references teaches or suggests the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 12 including at least wherein “the glaze layer contains at least one of phosphate ion, sulfate ion and chloride ion.”

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this


response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



Victoria D. Hao

Registration No. 47,630

Dated: September 25, 2003

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001